

on the enactment of authorizing legislation. No matter what the fate of the Interior appropriations bill this contingency must be included. It is bad public policy to disregard the terms of the LWCF Act and expend this significant amount of money for the purchase of additional Federal property absent a thorough, and open, public review. This review can be best done in the authorizing committee. I want to thank Senator GORTON, who sits on the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, for recognizing the need for specific authorizing legislation and including this contingency.

The Interior conference report also requires that the General Accounting Office review and report on the Baca Ranch appraisal. The Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Act requires an appraisal of the fair market value of private property the Federal government desires to acquire, whether through negotiations or condemnation. An appraisal has been done on the Baca Ranch. However, the appraisal was conducted not by the Federal government but rather the seller. While I have no reason to doubt the validity of the appraisal, before Congress spends this significant amount of money to purchase the Baca Ranch, Congress owes it to the American taxpayer to ensure that the \$101 million sale price represents the actual fair market value of the property. The General Accounting Office is the appropriate entity to conduct this review and report to the appropriators and the authorizers.

As many of us remember from two years ago, the conditions imposed on the Baca Ranch purchase are consistent with the requirements the Senate imposed on the Headwaters Forest and New World Mine purchases. Unfortunately, these conditions were eliminated in conference and both acquisitions were authorized on the fiscal year 1998 Interior appropriations bill. That is wrong. Clearly by agreeing to placing these limitations on the Baca Ranch acquisition, the House has realized that authorizing, the Headwaters Forest and New World Mine acquisitions in the appropriations bill was bad public policy. It is the role of the authorizing committee—not the appropriators—to make sure that any addition to the Federal estate is warranted.

There has been talk about the next step in the process. There are rumors that the President will not sign this conference report because he is disappointed that his Lands Legacy proposal was not totally funded. I hope that is not true but if it is I find this reasoning nonsensical. The Lands Legacy proposal is nothing but budget gimmicky. It seeks to charge against the \$900 million LWCF ceiling the increased funding of a variety of programs not authorized to derived monies from the LWCF. These programs, which may or may not warrant increased Federal funding, already have independent authorizations. By engag-

ing in this accounting game, the President artificially reduces the amounts available for programs authorized by the LWCF Act, including the state-side matching grant program. If the President seeks to fund these programs from the LWCF, he needs to introduce appropriate authorizing legislation and work with the Energy and Natural Resources Committee to accomplish this goal.

Finally—and most disturbing to me as chairman of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee—are indications that the Clinton Administration wants to permanently authorize the use of revenues from the Outer Continental Shelf for the Lands Legacy proposal in either the Interior appropriations bill or an omnibus appropriations bill. I support the use of OCS revenues as a permanent funding source for a variety of important conservation programs, in fact I introduced S. 25, the Conservation and Reinvestment Act of 1999, to accomplish this goal.

However, no matter how strong my support is for this goal, providing this authorization on any appropriations bill is wrong. This proposition is extremely controversial. In the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, we have held hearing after hearing on S. 25 and other OCS revenue sharing proposals. Since completion of those hearings, committee members have struggled to reach a compromise. We have struggled because, while every committee member cares about the conservation of this nation's natural resources, we each have a different vision as to how best to conserve and protect these resources. But no matter how difficult this challenge, we will continue to strive to reach an agreement that is acceptable not only to the Energy and Natural Resources Committee but also to the Senate.

What the Clinton administration is contemplating would be a unrivaled usurpation of the authorizing committees. If the most significant piece of conservation legislation introduced in the last 30 years is enacted on an appropriations bill without any public input or participation, all of us who are authorizers should turn in our gavels.

AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT—MOTION TO PROCEED

Mr. LOTT. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to Calendar No. 215, H.R. 434, the trade bill.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

Mr. LOTT. I now move to proceed to Calendar No. 215.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Madam President, the Senator from Iowa has been generous enough to let me speak a very short while on this measure, to tell you at the time we get on the bill the chairman of the Finance Committee,

who cannot be here at this moment, will offer a manager's amendment which includes the sub-Saharan Africa bill which we are now technically on, with the Caribbean Basin Initiative bill, as well as the reauthorization of the Generalized System of Preferences and the Trade Adjustment Assistance programs. These measures have been reported by the Committee on Finance by an all but unanimous vote, voice vote, in all these cases. We very much hope we will bring this to a successful conclusion.

At stake is two-thirds of a century of American trade policy going back to the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of 1934 for which there is a history. Cordell Hull began the policy, under President Roosevelt.

In 1930, the Senate and the House passed what became known as the Smoot-Hawley tariff. If you were to make a short list of five events that led to the Second World War, that would be one of them. The tariffs went to unprecedented heights here. As predicted, imports dropped by two-thirds, but as was not predicted so did exports. What had been a market correction—more than that, the stock market collapse in 1929—moved into a long depression from which we never emerged until the Second World War.

The British went off free trade to Commonwealth preferences, the Japanese began the Greater East Asian Co-prosperity Sphere, and in 1933, with unemployment at 25 percent, Adolph Hitler came into power as Chancellor of Germany. That sort of misses our memory. In 1934, Cordell Hull, Secretary of State, began the Reciprocal Trade Agreements program which was designed to bring down, by bilateral negotiations, the levels of tariffs. This has continued through administration after administration without exception since that time.

I would like to note in the bill we have before us that there are two measures of very large importance, both of which have expired. Unless we move now, we will again lose immeasurably important trade provisions for us.

The first of these is the Trade Adjustment Assistance program, which is now in its 37th year. I can stand here as one of the few persons—I suppose the only—who served in the administration of John F. Kennedy. I was an Assistant Secretary of Labor. President Kennedy had sent up a very ambitious bill, the Trade Expansion Act. It was really the only major legislation of his first term. It required, in order to meet the legitimate concerns of southern textile manufacturers and northern clothing unions—needle trades, let's say—that we get a long-term cotton textile agreement which Secretary Blumenthal, Secretary Hickman Price, Jr., and I negotiated in Geneva successfully. True to their word, the Southern Senators came right up to this measure and voted for it. But we added something special, which was trade adjustment assistance.

We agreed in a free trading situation, or freer trade situation, the economy at large and the population at large would be better off, but some would lose. Trade adjustment assistance was to deal with that situation. It had been first proposed, oddly, by a fine labor leader, David MacDonald, of the United Steel Workers, in 1954, saying if we are going to have lower barriers to trade, we are going to lose some jobs; gain others. It was based on a modest and fair request from American labor: If some workers are to lose their jobs as a result of freer trade that benefits the country as a whole, a program should be established to help those workers find new employment.

It was Luther Hodges, Secretary of Commerce under President Kennedy, who came before the Finance Committee to propose this measure. Secretary Hodges was the Governor of North Carolina, was he not? A wonderful man; I recall working with him. I know the Senator from South Carolina would. He said to the Finance Committee that "the Federal Government has a special responsibility in this case. When the Government has contributed to economic injuries, it should also contribute to the economic adjustments required to repair them."

This has been in law, and we added a special program for NAFTA, and for firms as well. It has been there for 37 years. The program has now expired. The continuing resolution keeps it going for 3 weeks or whatever, but if we lose this we lose a central feature of social legislation that has allowed us to become the world's greatest trading nation with the most extraordinary prosperity in the course of a generation.

There is also the matter of the Generalized System of Preferences for the developing world. It was a response to a plea by developing countries that the industrial world ought to give them an opportunity and a bit of incentive to compete in world markets; not to beg for aid, just to buy and sell. It has been in our legislation since the Trade Act of 1974, which makes it a quarter century in place. It was renewed in 1984. It is now on life support. We got a 15-month extension in 1993; a 10-month extension in 1994; 10 months in early 1996; 13 months in early 1997; 12 months in 1998.

We have responsibility in both of these matters. The Finance Committee has met that responsibility. In due course, we will bring this measure to the floor for what we hope will be a successful vote on renewal of Trade Adjustment Assistance and a 5-year reauthorization of the Generalized System of Preferences.

I do not want to keep the Senate any longer. I see my distinguished colleague is on the floor. I thank my friend from Iowa, and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Madam President, it is an agreed fact among our colleagues

in the Senate there is no member more steeped in history and erudite in its intellectual history than our distinguished senior Senator from New York, Mr. MOYNIHAN. I agree with him absolutely with respect to Trade Adjustment Assistance and the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and a variety of initiatives made since that time.

I have to oppose the motion because I am the one who objected, of course, to this so-called sub-Sahara/CBI bill.

One, with respect to Smoot-Hawley, it did not cause the depression and World War II. I want to disabuse anybody's mind from that particular suggestion. The stock market crash occurred in October 1929, and Smoot-Hawley was not passed until 8 months later in June of 1930.

At that particular time, slightly less than 1 percent of the GNP was in international trade. It is now up to 17 percent. At that time trade did not have that big an effect on the GNP or the economy of the United States itself. True, Germany, Europe, and everybody else was in a depression, and we entered the depression as a result of the crash.

Along came Cordell Hull. I want to emphasize one concept: the Reciprocal Trade Act of 1934; reciprocity; not foreign aid but foreign trade; a thing of value for an exchange of value. We learned that in Contracts 101 as lawyers.

Somehow over the past several years we have gotten into "we have to do something." We are the most powerful Nation militarily and economically; perhaps not the richest. We do not have the largest per capita income. We are down to about No. 8 or 9. We are not the richest, but we are very affluent comparatively speaking.

The urge is there, and I understand that urge to want to help, but we gave at the office. Let me tell you when I gave at the office, for my textile friends.

We have been giving and giving and giving. We had a hearing before the International Trade Commission. It was the Eisenhower administration at that particular time. I came to testify as the Governor of South Carolina. The finding was in June of 1960. It was in early March of 1960. I was chased around the room by none other than Tom Dewey. He was a lawyer for the Japanese. They were not a concern at the particular time. Ten percent of textiles consumed in America was being imported, and if we went beyond the 10 percent, it was determined that it would devastate the economy, particularly the textile economy of the United States of America.

I am looking around this room, and I can tell you that over two-thirds—that is a 2-year-old figure; I bet it is up to 70 percent—but two-thirds of the clothing I am looking at, not 10 percent, is imported.

When I say we gave at the office again and again—I can go to Desert Storm, and I will do that, and how we

gave Turkey a couple of billion dollars in increased textile imports, how we bought this crowd off, and every time we have a crisis, whatever it is, we give to people who ask for our help.

My point is, at that particular time, I left that hearing. I had a good Republican friend who knew President Eisenhower. We checked in with Jerry Parsons. I can still see him in the outer office. He said: The Chief can see you now. We went in and saw President Eisenhower and he was committed to helping the textile industry. But by June, it had gone the other way.

As a young Democratic southern Governor, I said: I am going to try that fellow Kennedy. I had never been with him, but I came up in August and sat down with Mike Feldman. He is still alive and can verify this. He was legislative assistant to John F. Kennedy. I can show my colleagues the office in the old Russell Building. We sat down and agreed that I will write this letter as a Governor and Senator Kennedy will write back because being from Massachusetts, he understood the desperate nature of the textile economy at that time. We exchanged letters. I will have to get that letter because our revered leader of that particular administration was, of course, and is still revered now, the Senator from New York, Mr. MOYNIHAN. He knows this more intimately than I, but I know this particular part of it.

We sat down and agreed because there was a national security provision. Before the President could take executive action, there had to be a finding that a particular commodity was important to the national security of the United States of America. We got the Secretary of Labor Arthur Goldberg, Secretary of Commerce Luther Hodges, Secretary of State Dean Rusk, Secretary McNamara of Defense, and Doug Dillon, Secretary of the Treasury. He was most interested. I sat down and talked with Secretary Dillon. He was fully briefed from my northern textile friends.

Incidentally, the Northern Textile Association met last weekend down in my hometown with Karl Spilhaus. Bill Sullivan previously ran the organization.

We brought in witnesses. We had hearings. And about April 26 they made a finding. Steel was the most important industry to our national economy and second most important to our national security was textiles. We could not send our soldiers to war in a Japanese uniform, and I used to add to that, and Gucci shoes.

Eighty-six percent of the shoes in this Chamber today are imported. The shoe industry is practically gone. Textiles are about gone, and Washington is telling them: You have to get high-tech, high-tech, global economy, global competition, retrain—it sounds like Mao Tse-tung running around reeducating the people, getting them skills.

We are closing down our knitting mills, one in particular was the Oneida

Mill. They made T-shirts. They had 487 employees. The average age was 47.

Tomorrow morning, let's say we have done it Washington's way, we have re-educated and trained the 487 employees, and now they are skilled computer operators. Are you going to hire a 47-year-old computer operator or the 21-year-old computer operator? You are not going to take on those health costs; you are not going to take on those retirement costs.

The little town of Andrew, SC, is high and dry, as are many other towns with so-called low unemployment, low inflation. Since NAFTA, South Carolina has lost 31,700 textile jobs. The reason I know that figure is because I talked with the Northern Textile Association last weekend. I am briefed on this particular subject.

What we have in the CBI/sub-Saharan—the intent is good, to help—but we cannot afford any longer to give away these critical industries important to our national security.

Specifically, I was with Akio Morita in Chicago in the early eighties. He was talking about the Third World developing and the developing countries. He said they must develop a strong manufacturing capacity in order to become a nation state.

Later on he said "And by the way, Senator, the world power that loses its manufacturing capacity will cease to be a world power."

Look at the back page of the U.S. News & World Report of last week, and the comments our friend Mort Zuckerman. You can see we are getting a divided society. We are losing those middle-class jobs. Henry Ford said: I want my workers to make enough to be able to buy what they are making. And our strong manufacturing economy has been drained overnight.

I will bring a list of the particular items, including textiles where import penetration is high. So when you get and look at the CBI, and you look at the sub-Saharan, it is NAFTA without—and I don't think NAFTA worked at all—without the advantages of NAFTA; namely, the side agreements on the environment, the side agreements on labor, the reciprocity. There is no reciprocity. If we are going to let their products come in duty free, we should tell them to lower their tariffs.

So this is a bad bill, to begin with. It should not have passed, almost unanimously, in that Finance Committee. They ought to look at these things more thoroughly. But the point is, we have to maintain these manufacturing jobs.

I can remember when I was a child—and I know the distinguished Senator from New York would remember—the last call for breakfast, Don McNeil and "Breakfast Club" up there in Chicago.

I feel like this is sort of the last call tonight for my textile friends. We will get into it more thoroughly because it isn't just the textile people. The truth is, I didn't carry Anderson, Greenville, and Spartanburg Counties, which have

all the textile votes. They are going to be voting—you watch them—for George W. Bush. They have already made up their mind. They don't care about the campaign. We had them going Democratic only one time since Kennedy, and that was just momentarily for Jimmy Carter. We gave Barry Goldwater more votes, in the 1964 race, than he got in Arizona; percentage-wise and number-wise, both.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. No?

Mr. HOLLINGS. Oh, yes. Barry used to love to kid me about that. So I know from whence I am coming. It is just that it is terrible to see this thing happen all around you. And the new, jobs and all the so-called new employment is going into retailing, and they are getting paid next to nothing. They will not even assume the health costs and everything else of that kind. So it is a real issue.

And they always do this to me. They did NAFTA right at the end of the session. Then on GATT, I had to make them come back after the election. Now we have another 10 days, and they want to raise it. And I have to make the same motion not to proceed.

I do appreciate the leadership and the brilliance of my leader, Senator MOYNIHAN, of our Finance Committee. I thank him for his courtesy. But I am going to have to continue to object to moving to consider and proceeding on this particular measure.

I yield the floor.

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Bravissimo.

Mr. GRASSLEY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

Mr. GRASSLEY. I thank the Chair.

Madam President, it is my privilege, for a few moments, to take the place of our distinguished chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, who will be here shortly, and in my capacity as chairman of that committee's Subcommittee on International Trade, to speak for our side in support of this legislation.

From the standpoint of speaking for our side, this is pretty much a bipartisan approach that will have overwhelming support. It is all the more a privilege to work for legislation that does have such broad bipartisan support.

So, Madam President, I rise in support of the motion to proceed to H.R. 434. When we have the opportunity, we intend to offer a managers' amendment. And we would do that as a substitute for the House-passed language. That substitute will include the Senate Finance Committee's reported bills on Africa, an expansion of the Caribbean Basin Initiative, an extension of the Generalized System of Preferences, and the reauthorization of the Trade Adjustment Assistance Act.

I want to explain the intent behind these different Finance Committee bills that will be grouped together in the managers' amendment.

Africa, as everyone knows, has undergone significant changes, as re-

cently as the last decade. Many of those changes have been enormously positive: an end to apartheid in South Africa, a groundswell in support of democracy in a number of the sub-Saharan countries, and a new openness to using the power of free markets to drive economic growth, with the resultant raising of living standards.

At the same time, there is no continent that has suffered more from the ravages of war, disease, hunger, and just simple want than Africa. The daily news has more often been filled with the images of violence and starvation than the small seeds of economic hope.

The question before us is, How can our great country, the United States, help the transition that Africans themselves have begun?

There are many problems we might try to address and an equal number of approaches to solving those problems. I am not going to argue that our managers' amendment we will offer is an entire panacea; nor is it equal to the tasks that our African partners have before them in the sense that if there is going to be real change there, it has to come from within.

Instead, what our approach attempts to do is to take a small but very significant step towards opening markets to African trade. The intent is to encourage productive investment there as a means of building a market economy and doing it from the ground up.

It is a means of giving Africans the opportunity to guide their own economic destiny rather than the economic policies of the past that attempted to dictate a particular model of development that was based upon so much government control of the economy.

The strongest endorsement I can offer for moving this legislation comes from these African countries themselves. Every one of the sub-Saharan African nations eligible for the benefits under this proposal has endorsed our efforts. There was a recent full-page advertisement in Roll Call that you may have seen recounting the number of U.S. organizations that support this initiative. They range from the NAACP to the Southern Christian Leadership Conference to the National Council of Churches.

Our supporters include such notables as Coretta Scott King, Andrew Young, and Robert Johnson—the head of Black Entertainment Television who testified eloquently about the need to create new economic opportunities in Africa when he appeared before our Senate Finance Committee.

The effort to move the bill also enjoys broad bipartisan support that I have already alluded to and complimented our colleagues on. It goes beyond bipartisanship in this body. It goes to the President himself because in his State of the Union Address, he identified this bill as one of his top foreign policy and trade priorities. The Finance Committee's ranking member, as you have already heard, Senator

MOYNIHAN, is a cosponsor and public supporter of the Africa bill, along with being a tireless advocate of trade expansion in both word and deed over several decades.

The distinguished minority leader was one of the first to recognize the need for a special focus on Africa in trade terms when he called for such a program as part of the Uruguay Round implementing legislation that passed this body 4 years ago. And, the very fact the majority leader has found time for us to debate this bill this late in this session, when there is so much pressure to address other issues, is indicative of our majority leader's support.

So in summation, you can see strong bipartisan support exists for the managers' amendment, and that the managers' amendment will also include the Caribbean Basin Initiative.

The approach adopted by the Finance Committee is consistent with the administration's own proposal. It is also broadly consistent with the proposal introduced by Senator GRAHAM, who has also been a tireless advocate on behalf of the Caribbean Basin Initiative and the opportunity that that bill and that program provide for the beneficiary countries in the Caribbean and Central America.

In substance, the managers' amendment on CBI adopts an approach similar to that afforded sub-Saharan Africa under the proposed bill. Indeed, both of those proposals build on the model established with the passage of the original CBI legislation, I believe, now, 15 or 16 years ago.

In fact, it was 1983 that that bill was adopted. When it was adopted, the region was beset with economic problems and wrenched with civil strife. The goal of the original legislation was to encourage new economic opportunities and a path towards both political and economic renewal. It accomplished that by offering a unilateral grant of tariff preferences designed to encourage productive investment, economic growth, and the resultant higher standard of living.

The original Caribbean Basin Initiative, which we made permanent in 1990, recognized that economic hope was essential to peace and political stability throughout the region. However, since 1990 we have had the intervening negotiation of the North American Free Trade Agreement, and that undercut the preferences initially offered to the Caribbean and Central American beneficiaries of the Caribbean Basin Initiative.

So the managers' amendment we will offer is an attempt to restore that margin of preference to the Caribbean producers and the economic opportunity the original CBI legislation was designed to create.

It is also an attempt to respond to the hardships the region has faced due to natural disaster. That region, as we know, including both the Caribbean and Central America, has been hard hit

in the past 2 years by a series of hurricanes that in some instances devastated much of the existing economic infrastructure. No one can forget the pictures of devastation we saw of the Dominican Republic, Guatemala, and Honduras following Hurricane Mitch—homes, farms, factories, we saw on television, literally washing away overnight, buried in clay.

Members of the Finance Committee and many of our other colleagues had the opportunity to meet recently with the presidents of a number of Central American countries. Those presidents indicated that the single most important action we in the United States and our Government could take in their interest was not foreign assistance but economic opportunity to compete in a growing regional market.

They saw this proposed legislation as a fulfillment of the promise extended by this Congress in that original legislation of 1983, the promise for a new economic relationship with the Caribbean and Central America. We must continue to fulfill that promise as, hopefully, our country keeps its promises, and not act as a charity but as a continuation of the leadership we have shown in our continent and our hemisphere, leadership that has put us on the cusp of the ultimate goal of the 21st century version of the Monroe Doctrine, a hemisphere of democratically elected governments, a hemisphere of free markets, and a hemisphere with rising standards of living.

By moving this legislation forward, we will help these economies continue to grow and we will be investing in important markets that will become more integrated with our own, a market integration that benefits the United States as well.

In light of that fact, it might be worth mentioning the importance of this legislation to one industry in particular, the textile industry, something the Senator from South Carolina has addressed but from a different point of view than I. When I say textile industry, I mean everyone from a farmer growing cotton to the yarn spinner, the fabric maker, the apparel manufacturer, producers of textile manufacturing equipment, as well as the wholesalers and retailers, everything from the farm to the consumer. The Africa bill and the Caribbean Basin Initiative bills are drafted to create a win-win situation for both our trading partners and for our own domestic industries.

The managers' amendment we will offer takes a different approach than that of the House bill. Our bill is designed to create a partnership between America and industries, not to the benefit of one or the other, but to the benefit of both regions. Our proposal would accomplish that by affording preferential tariff and also preferential quota treatment to apparel made from American-made fabric, and it would be American-made fabric in order to qualify.

This does two things: First, it gives American firms an incentive to build a

strong partnership with firms in both Africa and the Caribbean. Secondly, it helps establish a platform from which the American textile industry can compete in this global market.

I want to refer to the industry's own analysis. That analysis shows that the approach adopted by our Senate Finance Committee offers real benefits to U.S. industry and to U.S. employment. It gives our industry a fighting chance in the years to come, as textile quotas are gradually eliminated pursuant to the World Trade Organization agreement on textiles.

The reason I raise this point goes back to the efforts of our committee and our chairman to reestablish a bipartisan consensus on trade. In my view, the textile industry and all of its related parts will face significant economic adjustment as a result of the World Trade Organization textiles agreement. That adjustment has already begun to take place.

What the industry found, however, based on its experience under NAFTA, is that partnering with Mexican firms or investing there for joint United States-Mexican production made our own United States firms very competitive. They discovered that United States firms became competitive even in the face of fierce competition they faced from textile industries in the developing world, and particularly the countries of China and India.

The Finance Committee bills would broaden the base from which American firms could produce for the world market. In the context of the Uruguay Round, we made an implicit commitment to the textile industry to allow them a period of adjustment to a new economic reality. I am proud to support the proposed legislation and to make good on that promise by encouraging the industry to compete globally as well as locally.

Through our managers' amendment, we intend to propose something that would take two other significant steps. The first is the renewal of the Generalized System of Preferences. We call that GSP for short. The GSP program has been on our statutes since 1975. GSP affords a grant of tariff preferences to developing countries generally, although not as extensive as those the proposal offers to Africa and to the Caribbean. GSP is generally described as a unilateral grant of preferences, and that is a very accurate description.

What is little known is that the program has had more profound benefits for U.S. trade than is captured by that fairly significant description that doesn't describe the program so well.

The original GSP program was instrumental in obtaining the commitment of continental powers like Great Britain to give up, finally, the highly discriminatory tariff systems they enforced in their economic relations with their former colonies. In other words, the creation of the GSP was instrumental in eliminating discriminatory

trade barriers that distorted trade and thwarted our exporters' access to markets throughout the entire developing world.

That beneficial program—GSP—has been around a while and accomplished a lot of good, but it has lapsed; it lapsed a few months ago, in June. So our managers' amendment would propose its renewal.

The managers' amendment will also renew our Trade Adjustment Assistance programs. As my colleagues know, I am a strong supporter of free and fair trade. But I have, at the same time, consistently taken the view that those who benefit from expanding trade must look out for those who may be injured by the process of economic adjustment that trade brings.

The Trade Adjustment Assistance programs are one part of that commitment. They offer assistance to both workers and firms that have faced a significant increase in import competition as they adjust to these new economic conditions. They have been on the books since the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. And the committee has made every effort to ensure that they are renewed to fulfill the bargain on trade policy originally struck with U.S. firms and U.S. workers over 30 years ago. So what we do with this reauthorization is keep our contract with these industries, and if trade unfairly affects them, we will be able to help them in a transition period. That is something we should do. It has worked well and we propose to continue it.

There is, however, a real urgency to their renewal at this time. As I have said, they have lapsed and, unless they are renewed promptly, they will fall out of the budget baseline and will, in the future, need a revenue offset.

In the context of the current debate over trade and trade policy, I view these programs as a minimum downpayment on reestablishing a bipartisan consensus on trade matters. And so I urge our colleagues to support the motion to proceed to the bill in order to renew these essential programs.

Having discussed the intent behind each of the measures I intend to move as a part of the Senate substitute, I want to add one last point. We have before us in this legislation an opportunity to reestablish a strong measure of bipartisan support for what we in the Finance Committee view as an important trade and foreign policy initiative. So let us take this step and let us move forward in a way that will benefit Africa and the Caribbean—a way that will benefit much of the rest of the developing world—and a way that will serve our own national interests as well.

And we propose this legislation with the U.S. national interest in mind, because we are cognizant of the fact that if we in the Congress do not look out for the interests of the American worker, we can't expect anybody else to do it. But when we can have the benefits of protecting our workers and creating

jobs and expanding our economy and still help the rest of the world through these policies—and we have done that—we should continue to do that because, as President Kennedy said, "Trade, not aid."

For an American populace that doesn't like foreign aid, I hope that they will join us in the Congress behind these bipartisan efforts to promote our national interests and strengthen our world leadership through these trade policies that help us, as well as helping these developing nations.

I yield the floor.

Madam President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BROWNBACK. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BROWNBACK. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that there now be a period for the transaction of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EMERGENCY MONEY FOR AMERICA'S FARMERS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Madam President, I would like to say a few words about the \$69 billion annual U.S. Department of Agriculture appropriations bill that happens to contain \$8.7 billion in emergency money for American farmers.

This legislation was sent from Capitol Hill to the President's desk last Wednesday, October 13. Every day the President delays signing this bill is one more day relief money is not in the farmers' pockets at this time of the lowest prices in 25 years.

Naturally, I know the White House is entitled to a few days to review the document for signature by the President. But that process does not and should not take 8 days that the bill has been sitting on the President's desk, particularly considering the emergency economic crisis in American agriculture.

Since September 30, President Clinton has been engaged in a strategy to confuse the public and to try to get Congress to accept tax and spending increases. The only conclusion I can draw is that the President has decided to use the agricultural relief bill for leverage in the political game we have seen with the budget this year. If that is true—and I hope it is not true, based on some comments made by Secretary Glickman; but the fact remains, the President has not signed the bill containing emergency relief for farmers—then, of course, it is unforgivable on the part of

the President, given the terrible situation our farmers face.

Again, prices remain at 25-year lows. The package we moved through Congress is critical to helping farmers' cash-flow. President Clinton has given speeches about helping farmers. Why isn't he taking, then, affirmative action and putting pen to paper to help the farmers who he knows have tremendous needs at a time of prices being at 25-year lows?

Last year, an election year, the President immediately signed the supplemental spending bill that contained more than \$5 billion, when this crisis in agriculture started 12 months ago. The U.S. Department of Agriculture had those funds in the mail to farmers within 10 days. The President has already lost 7 days in that process. This year, of course, is a sharp contrast with getting the bill signed and getting the money to the farmers. Every day that President Clinton delays is one more day that farmers don't have the assistance Congress passed and they desperately need.

I happen to know that the President understands American agriculture, being the Governor of the State of Arkansas for as long as he was. I know that one time, in his first couple years in office, he looked me in the eye at a meeting at the Blair House and he said, "I understand farming more than any other President of the United States ever has." I believe that, but he doesn't show an understanding of the crisis in agriculture at this particular time, as he has waited now too many days to sign this bill.

I urge the President this very evening to sign this bill so that the farmers who are in crisis—which he has even given speeches on, recognizing farming is in crisis—can have the help of the \$2.7 billion provided for in this legislation.

I yield the floor.

NOMINATION OF JUSTICE RONNIE WHITE

Mr. LEAHY. Madam President, for many months I had been calling for a fair vote on the nomination of Justice Ronnie White to the federal court. Instead, the country witnessed a party line vote as all 54 Republican members of the Senate present that day voted against confirming this highly qualified African-American jurist to the federal bench. I believe that vote to have been unprecedented—the only party line vote to defeat a judicial nomination I can find in our history.

There was brief debate on this nomination and two others the night before the vote. At that time, I attempted, as best I could through questions in the limited opportunity allotted, to clarify the record of this outstanding judge with respect to capital punishment appeals and to outline his background and qualifications.

I noted that Justice White had, in fact, voted to uphold the imposition of